

Message

From: ROJAS-MICKELSON, DAEWON [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=02A4364798134504950595EC9E8D2098-DROJASMI]
Sent: 3/22/2018 6:41:34 PM
To: Fennessy, Christopher [christopher.fennessy@Rocket.com]; Keller, Lynn [Keller.Lynn@epa.gov]; MacNicholl, Peter@DTSC (Peter.MacNicholl@dtsc.ca.gov) (Peter.MacNicholl@dtsc.ca.gov) [Peter.MacNicholl@dtsc.ca.gov]; MacDonald, Alex@Waterboards (Alex.MacDonald@waterboards.ca.gov) [Alex.MacDonald@waterboards.ca.gov]; 'jrohrer@dtsc.ca.gov' [jrohrer@dtsc.ca.gov]
CC: Hanley, Valerie@DTSC [Valerie.Hanley@dtsc.ca.gov]; Varljen, Mark [Mark.Varljen@Rocket.com]
Subject: RE: March 2018 Agency Technical Meeting Notes and Action Items for afternoon discussion

Chris,

Thanks for sending out these notes. I do want to clarify that the groundwater remedy is currently protective but the issues in the FYR do affect future protectiveness. The actions identified below will provide confidence that steps can be taken to prevent significant risk to the public but they will not allow an affirmation of future protectiveness. EPA senior management also has concerns regarding the groundwater migration metric, which is presently groundwater not under control. But as we talked about yesterday this cannot be changed until all the FYR groundwater issues are resolved and it will take some time.

I believe 3-4 months for RfR determinations is a realistic timeframe. Six months is very conservative, sorry if that wasn't clear yesterday.

Have a nice weekend,
Daewon

From: Fennessy, Christopher [mailto:christopher.fennessy@Rocket.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:33 AM
To: Keller, Lynn <Keller.Lynn@epa.gov>; MacNicholl, Peter@DTSC (Peter.MacNicholl@dtsc.ca.gov) (Peter.MacNicholl@dtsc.ca.gov) <Peter.MacNicholl@dtsc.ca.gov>; MacDonald, Alex@Waterboards (Alex.MacDonald@waterboards.ca.gov) <Alex.MacDonald@waterboards.ca.gov>; 'jrohrer@dtsc.ca.gov' <jrohrer@dtsc.ca.gov>; ROJAS-MICKELSON, DAEWON <rojas-mickelson.daewon@epa.gov>
Cc: Hanley, Valerie@DTSC <Valerie.Hanley@dtsc.ca.gov>; Varljen, Mark <Mark.Varljen@Rocket.com>
Subject: March 2018 Agency Technical Meeting Notes and Action Items for afternoon discussion

Protectiveness Determination

- Aerojet and EPA both would like EPA to be able to make a statement to EPA senior management that the Aerojet remedy is protective of public health and the environment
- Groundwater – EPA stated that it could make a protectiveness statement for groundwater as long as there is not a realized risk today and we have a plan that:
 - o identifies all the vulnerabilities and a trigger (sentinel well) for each vulnerability
 - o specifies monitoring requirements and response requirements (remedy implementation requirements) if a trigger event occurs for each vulnerability
 - o includes calculations and schedules for the time from trigger event to realized risk and the time to respond to a trigger event
 - o ensures that the time to respond to trigger event is shorter than the time between trigger event and realized risk
- **Mark to prepare initial list of vulnerabilities by April 6.**
- Vapor Intrusion – EPA stated that it could make a protectiveness statement following the review of the March VI report and following confirmation that all of the immediate risks have been addressed and a plan is in place for all of the long term risks.

Ready for Reuse – EPA stated that AR can plan for a 4-6 month time for EPA to prepare a ready for reuse determination letter once all documentation has been provided to EPA.

Winter Indoor Air Sampling Event Update – Provided summary of February 2018 monitoring results. **Chris to forward results to Valerie Hanley.**

Ambient Air Sampling Event Update – Provided summary of February 2018 monitoring results. **Chris to forward results to Valerie Hanley.** AR requested EPA to review purpose for final round of ambient air monitoring. AR feels that since the risk has been identified and selected remedy requires source removal followed by monitoring to confirm that the existing ambient air issue has been resolved, there is no longer a need to continue pre-source removal ambient air monitoring. **Lynn to confirm with EPA risk and VI folks.**

Area 40 Soil Vapor monitoring - AR requested DTSC to review purpose for additional rounds of soil vapor sampling to evaluate temporal trends. **Chris to forward e-mail from Chris to Peter regarding vapor sampling to Valerie Hanley.** AR feels that since the risk has been identified and selected remedy requires vapor mitigation beneath all structures regardless of soil vapor concentration and source removal followed by monitoring to confirm that the soil vapor concentrations are not above VM thresholds, there is no longer a need to continue pre-source removal soil vapor monitoring. **Peter to confirm with DTSC GSU folks.**

Review of FS/RAP comments – DTSC stated they would have formal comments on FS by March 23. EPA stated that due to staff limitations, FS comments would not be available until April 6. However, EPA stated that there are not questions about the remedy, rather whether the risks are portrayed and addressed correctly in the FS. AR reiterated that the schedule is to issue the RAP along with CEQA document to public by May 1. **Chris to schedule CEQA public participation kick off meeting. Chris to schedule a court reporter for the May CAG meeting.**

ARAR discussion – EPA having difficulty with ARARs that will be defined in RAP and how their ROD will present ARARs. **Alex to schedule meeting between EPA and State, with attorneys to resolve EPA ARAR issue.**

CEQA – USEPA reviewing need for NEPA because EPA had comments on the EIS that they feel the City of Folsom did not address. AR stated that the developers are submitting 404 permit applications for each of the developments as they occur. The developers have not submitted the 404 permit application for the development that includes Area 40. AR stated that it is premature to process a 404 permit application now; however, it would go through the 404 permitting process once the details of the remedy are flushed out in the remedial design documents. **Lynn to follow up with EPA to confirm that NEPA is not required at this time.**

DTSC oversight MOU – EPA stated that it was just about finished with the language and ready to send back to DTSC for final review and signature. MOU will include remedy implementation. AR has provided DTSC language that shows that PCD can be interpreted to cover preparation of additional documents and the oversight costs associated with these documents. **Chris to send this language to Lynn.**

Let me know if I missed anything. Chris

Christopher M. Fennessy, P.E.

Aerojet Rocketdyne, Inc.

Engineering Manager, Site Remediation

11260 Pyrites Way, Suite 125

Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Ph: 916-355-3341

Fax: 916-355-6145

Email: Christopher.Fennessy@Rocket.com